

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 93 04:30:12 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #341  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest

Sun, 19 Sep 93

Volume 93 : Issue 341

Today's Topics:

A real use for CW  
Codeless Tech Debate  
Codeless Technician  
just give HF to U.P.S.  
Neighborhood watch groups (2 msgs)  
Posession & Illegal Confiscation of Amateur Radios?  
Who Wrote Scratchi?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1993 14:33:46 GMT  
From: das.wang.com!wang!dbushong@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: A real use for CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> writes:

>In article <y2Vy0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert,  
>robert@amanda.jpunix.com writes:  
>>Sounds to me like you should have taken a more CW-literate hunting buddy  
>>with you.

>Well I guess you could say I hunt with the scum of the earth....Fancy  
>that, he can't copy the most modern form of communication know to man.  
>He is the worst kind of Riff Raff in the world.....I will be looking for  
>a better hunting buddy next year.....NOT!

CW is more modern than human speech, you know.....

--  
Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc. Amateur Radio Callsign KZ10  
Project Leader, Recognition products kz1o@n0ary.#noca.ca.na  
Internet: dbushong@wang.com ARRL VE // W5YI VE

-----  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1993 12:54:38 -0700

From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <27clnuINNt19@chester.ksu.ksu.edu>, cbr600@chester.ksu.ksu.edu  
(Jeremy "The J Man" Utley) wrote:

> I have followed the debate over the codeless Technician class Ham license with  
> great interest. I, as a recent No-Code license recipient, feel that this debate  
> has long since been exhausted.

I as an Extra licenced since 1961, having 200+ CW countries etc. etc.  
\*fully\* agree with you! I have been following this flamewar for over 5  
years now and have seen very little new.

I do like to "join the fray" and argue every now and then though :-)

To me the interesting question is "what do we do now?" Cointinue to simply  
drop license requirements until we get a "no test license"? I certainly  
hope not! Substitute some more relevent test for the General-Extra class  
licenses? Good idea, but what?

CW does still have value as an introduction to all kinds of "radio things",  
but I cannot believe that CW is the \*only\* such tool. I admit though that  
I am at a loss to suggest a good substitute.

--  
Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----  
Date: Thu, 16 Sep 93 20:46:44 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!  
menudo.uh.edu!junix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Codeless Technician  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> --Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."

Then all these No-Code Techs must be VERY patriotic.

--Robert

---

Date: 17 Sep 1993 13:08:48 -0500  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swrinde!  
pirates.cs.swt.edu!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: just give HF to U.P.S.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I think the present requirement for 13wpm code to operate on the HF bands is just swell! The folks that use these bands have a legitimate right to protect \*their\* bands. Many of these folks are older and got their licenses when it was \*much\* harder to get one. The code is the last hurdle protecting their bands from being used by just anybody! Like guys that pass all 5 written tests in one sitting (lothsome curs). Anyway debate on this issue is moot. It is a self rectifying situation. When the code guys are all dead and all the rest of the amateurs are preoccupied with sending digital voice around the world via satellite and megabaud UHF links the FCC will give the HF spectrum to someone who wants it.

With greatest sincerity,

Bruce  
N4USH

--  
Bruce M. Marshall bmm1@freenet.fsu.edu voice 615 481 0990 fax 615 481 8039

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 93 20:35:56 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!  
menudo.uh.edu!junix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dparker@netcom.com (Dave Parker) writes:

> >>: Or...establish your OWN repeater.  
> >  
> >>OH? On what freqs? There are none left that won't QRM existing ones.  
> >

> >I don't think a repeater is needed. Most neighborhood watch groups only cover  
> an area of less than 1/2 mile in extent, so HT's should work fine, and if  
> needed, a base station could handle relays.  
>  
> How about one of those simplex repeaters? Would this be good/bad idea?

The problem with the "store and forward" (simplex) repeaters is that they're difficult and time-consuming to use. Given the small area of operation, and your desire to stay clear of established machines, I have a suggestion: Why not have one person as the designated "net control." He (or she) would be at a central base station, and could receive reports and give instructions to the patrol units (on handhelds). In order to increase privacy from eavesdroppers, you could conduct your activities on split frequencies, where the portables transmit on one, and the base on the other.

--Robert

---

Date: 17 Sep 1993 19:56:30 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>dpark@netcom.com (Dave Parker) writes:

>> >>: Or...establish your OWN repeater.  
>> >>OH? On what freqs? There are none left that won't QRM existing ones.  
>> >I don't think a repeater is needed...HT's should work fine...  
>> How about one of those simplex repeaters? Would this be good/bad idea?

In article <LmZZ0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>  
robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>The problem with the "store and forward" (simplex) repeaters is that  
>they're difficult and time-consuming to use...

I've got it! I've got it! Have a CW traffic net on 80 meters between the portable stations. Ground wave propagation is excellent on that band and the operators would only have to pass the 5 wpm Novice license. And they would make their presence in the neighborhood known since each one would be carrying a 20 ft. vertical antenna with a "bug-catcher" loading coil in the middle. And there would be no problem with the "wrong people" getting involved since a CW op's character

is unassailable. What a wonderful idea!

(You think I'd sign \*this\*?)

-----  
Date: 19 Sep 1993 05:01:30 GMT

From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!hobbes.cc.uga.edu!aisun3.ai.uga.edu!mcovingt@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Posession & Illegal Confiscation of Amateur Radios?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

One thing I do intend to suggest to our housing department, the next time I bump into one of the appropriate people, is that they add the following to the rule sheet:

--  
CORDLESS PHONES: Use of cordless telephones in dorms is not recommended. Within a single building, they often interfere with each other, and conversations can be overheard on other cordless phones that are using the same frequencies.

--

Note: No ban; just a timely warning.

--  
:- Michael A. Covington, Associate Research Scientist : \*\*\*\*\*  
:- Artificial Intelligence Programs mcovingt@ai.uga.edu : \*\*\*\*\*  
:- The University of Georgia phone 706 542-0358 : \* \* \*  
:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : \*\* \*\*\* \*\* <><

-----  
Date: Sat, 18 Sep 1993 14:56:03 GMT

From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!indirect.com!jbromley@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Who Wrote Scratchi?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <jchappel.43.748281774@sander.lockheed.com>  
jchappel@sander.lockheed.com (Joel Chappell, KC1SG writes:

>\*\*\*\*\* Explain "fist" to the No-Code kiddies out there in radioland\*\*\*\*\*

Heh, heh. Ask this question over on alt.sex.bondage and see what answer you get. And maybe an offer of a demonstration. ;-)

-- W5GYJ

--

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ      All opinions strictly my own.  
5128 N. 69th Avenue      tel: 602-848-8711  
Glendale, AZ 85303      Internet: jbromley@indirect.com

-----

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 1993 18:31:29 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep9.221831.3302@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,  
<6373@catnip.berkeley.ca.us>, <1993Sep15.205224.22902@peavax.mlo.dec.com>~4  
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

mcleman@zso.dec.com (Jeff McLeman) writes:

[Incestuous Drivel Deleted for Decorum]

Well, I see that the Code Wars have descended to a new low...

--  
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1993 09:09:14 -0700  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CCr1Gq.JoK@fc.hp.com>, <1993Sep3.141737.5803@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CDGLw5.2us@fc.hp.com>  
Subject : Re: Updating the test

In article <CDGLw5.2us@fc.hp.com>, perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) wrote:

> Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

> : No. The treaty language implementing the WARC agreements does not  
> : specify a Morse speed. It just says the applicant shall demonstrate  
> : the ability to send by hand and receive by ear texts in the International  
> : Morse code.

> OK, I stand corrected by several - 5 wpm is not mentioned. So, what's  
> the number? 1 character per fortnight? :-)

As I understand the treaty simply having the applicant stumble out the CW

for "SOS" or "TEST" once would be sufficient for the treaty. Treaties tend to be that way, they leave lots of loopholes for things some government might want to "fake" without actually violating the treaty.

I won't pretend that this would be anything but a "fake", but it would comply with the treaty.

> The regulation establishes a common communication mode (watering hole)  
> for primary users on a shared-allocation frequency (e.g. 30 and 40  
> meters) to get rid of QRM from secondary (ham) users. How long would it  
> take to send "Get off my frequency" at 1 character per fortnight? How  
> would you distinguish it from someone tuning up? :-) Is it reasonable  
> to tie up a primary op for this length of time? Go ahead - name a speed  
> below 5wpm and justify its reasonability.

No one (including the treaty drafters) has made any pretense about "reasonability" here.

--  
Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----  
Date: 19 Sep 1993 04:57:56 GMT

From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!hobbes.cc.uga.edu!aisun3.ai.uga.edu!mcovingt@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ahLvt\*-j1@ve3faq.UUCP>, <1993Sep7.154112.23611@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1993Sep8.173138.21542@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>hnet.e  
Subject : Re: Posession & Illegal Confiscation of Amateur Radios?

In article <1993Sep8.173138.21542@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@ogg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>In article <ahLvt\*-j1@ve3faq.UUCP> smc@ve3faq.UUCP (Scott McIntyre) writes:  
>>A few weeks ago, I received my registration package for the upcoming school  
>>year, and I noticed a new "rule" on the student conduct sheet. The new rule  
>>pertained to communication devices. All cellular telephones, pagers, \_and  
>>two way radio devices\_ were banned from being anywhere on school property,  
>

>I would suggest that you talk to them to see why they are doing this. Is it  
>due to teachers being upset by cellular phones/pagers in class? Is it the  
>folks who run the cable system getting too many complaints about interference  
>or is it the computer folks worrying about noise on their network? It would  
>be a good idea to talk to them reasonably to see their point of view - perhaps  
>they have gotten some misconceptions about one type of radio (cellular?) and  
>are just making a blanket ban without thinking it out. Offer to work with

>them to find a compromise...

Hear, hear! School administrators do not like to look ridiculous. Probably some well-meaning administrator has been grossly misinformed about a technological matter, or there is a problem you are unaware of. Quite likely they meant to impose a much narrower restriction but didn't know enough about the technology to know what exceptions to make. Does this school have any hams on the faculty?

--

:- Michael A. Covington, Associate Research Scientist : \*\*\*\*\*  
:- Artificial Intelligence Programs mcovingt@ai.uga.edu : \*\*\*\*\*  
:- The University of Georgia phone 706 542-0358 : \* \* \*  
:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : \*\* \*\*\* \*\* <><

-----

Date: 17 Sep 93 23:20:40 GMT  
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhubb2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep14.150323.22167@bsu-ucs>, <stevewCDEIMC.Dp@netcom.com>, <wtr-150993143407@wralston.mitre.org>ub2  
Subject : Re: Restrictions on antenna hght

In article <wtr-150993143407@wralston.mitre.org> wtr@mitre.org (Bill Ralston) writes:

>  
>I wish we had an antenna height restriction in my town - the building  
>inspector (at the time I asked) would have realized that antennas are  
>allowed. Since there is no mention of antenna height limits in the bylaws,  
>he chose to interpret the zoning bylaws as not allowing antennas, and told  
>me my permit would be denied. (He was subsequently found to be taking  
>bribes, so I suspect he really just wanted me to discuss the "fee" I was  
>willing to pay for a permit...)  
>

I've the same problem in my town...the zoning ordinances make no specific mention of antennas, so the standard 30-foot limit on buildings applies also to antennas :-( Of course if I wasn't so darn lazy I would file an application for a variance, but then again my 40-foot inverted vee has been doing fine for a couple of years now with no complaints even though it's over the height limit.

--

[] [] [] [] [] Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ NCR Torrey Pines  
[] [] [] [] [] kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com (619) 597-3602  
[] [] [] [] [] kevin%beacons@cyber.net  
[] [] [] [] []

[] [] [] [] [] [] Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 1993 18:26:28 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!  
perry@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.93Sep1093436@urth.eng.sun.com>, <CCr1Gq.JoK@fc.hp.com>, <1993Sep3.141737.5803@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Updating the test

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:  
: In article <CCr1Gq.JoK@fc.hp.com> perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:  
: >  
: >There is a 5 wpm international treaty/convention, Japan notwithstanding.  
: >(Just because someone gets away with larceny doesn't make it right.)  
  
: No. The treaty language implementing the WARC agreements does not  
: specify a Morse speed. It just says the applicant shall demonstrate  
: the ability to send by hand and receive by ear texts in the International  
: Morse code.  
  
: Also, what Japan has done is not a violation of the treaty. The WARC  
: process allows any nation to make footnote exceptions to clauses of  
: the implementation language. Japan chose to exercise that right and  
: made an official exception note.

OK, I stand corrected by several - 5 wpm is not mentioned. So, what's the number? 1 character per fortnight? :-)

The regulation establishes a common communication mode (watering hole) for primary users on a shared-allocation frequency (e.g. 30 and 40 meters) to get rid of QRM from secondary (ham) users. How long would it take to send "Get off my frequency" at 1 character per fortnight? How would you distinguish it from someone tuning up? :-) Is it reasonable to tie up a primary op for this length of time? Go ahead - name a speed below 5wpm and justify its reasonability.

As Gary points out, the US is in apparent violation of international law. I'll leave it up to him to bring our government regulations back into compliance, either by footnote or regression to pre-VE days.

It's hard to be reasonable about something as unreasonable as Morse Code.

Perry Scott  
AA0ET

---

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #341  
\*\*\*\*\*